

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22nd Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 WAYMO LLC,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
16 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING
LLC,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL ITS OPPOSITION TO
UBER'S MOTION TO COMPEL RFP &
ROG RESPONSES, ENFORCE ORDER,
AND COMPEL 30(B)(6) TESTIMONY**

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11 and 79-5, Plaintiff Waymo LLC (“Waymo”) respectfully requests to file under seal information in its August 17, 2017 Opposition to Uber’s Motion to Compel RFP & ROG Reponses, Enforce Order, and Compel 30(b)(6) Testimony. Specifically, Waymo requests an order granting leave to file under seal the portions of the documents as listed below:

Document	Portions to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party
Portions of Waymo’s August 17, 2017 Opposition to Uber’s Motion to Compel RFP & ROG Reponses, Enforce Order, and Compel 30(b)(6) Testimony	Portions highlighted in green	Waymo

I. LEGAL STANDARD

Civil Local Rule 79-5 requires that a party seeking sealing “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civil L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

II. THE COURT SHOULD SEAL WAYMO’S CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

The Court should seal the information identified by Waymo in the table above. Waymo seeks to file this information under seal because it discloses Waymo’s confidential business information, including descriptions of Waymo’s highly confidential merger and acquisition activities. *See* Cooper Dec. ¶ 3. Confidential business information that, if released, may “harm a litigant’s competitive standing” merits sealing. *See Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598-99 (1978). Waymo seeks to seal confidential business information squarely within this category. Cooper Dec. ¶ 3. Waymo also seeks to seal the names of Waymo employees identified in its opposition to protect their privacy interests. *Id.* Waymo has narrowly tailored its requests to only information meriting sealing. *Id.* Thus, the Court should grant Waymo’s administrative motion to seal.

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 In compliance with Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), redacted and unredacted versions of the
3 above listed documents accompany this Administrative Motion. For the foregoing reasons,
4 Waymo respectfully requests that the Court grant Waymo's Administrative Motion.

5
6 DATED: August 17, 2017

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,
LLP

7
8 By /s/ Charles Verhoeven

Charles Verhoeven

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28